

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action mailed March 29, 2004. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1, 3 – 7, 9 – 24, 26 and 29 – 35 remain pending. In particular, Applicants have amended claims 1, 4 – 7, 9 – 17, 24, 29, 30 and 34, and have canceled claims 2, 8, 25, 27 and 28 without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Applicants have canceled claims 2, 8, 25, 27 and 28 merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of these canceled claims in a continuing application, if Applicants so choose, and do not intend to dedicate the canceled subject matter to the public. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

In the Specification

As set forth above, Applicants have amended the specification to include the serial number of the application that was identified originally by title and inventors. Applicants respectfully assert that no new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action indicates that claims 1, 14 and 16 – 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Levine*. The Office Action also indicates that claims 24, 26, 28 – 30, 34 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Duke '910*. With respect to claim 28, Applicants have canceled this claim and respectfully assert that the rejection as to this claim has been rendered moot. With respect to the remaining claims, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

In this regard, *Levine* generally involves a centralized print server. However, as indicated in the Office Action at page 7, *Levine* does not teach or otherwise involve recommending a service. This is in direct contrast to the limitations recited in Applicants' amended claims.

With respect to *Duke '910*, *Duke '910* generally involves an interactive communication method and system. However, as indicated in the Office Action at pages 16 and 17, *Duke '910* does not teach or otherwise involve recommending a service. This is in direct contrast to the limitations recited in Applicants' amended claims, as is discussed below.

In this regard, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite:

1. A method for intelligently routing hard-copy generation tasks, comprising:
 - accessing imaging service data from a network connected computing device;
 - accessing imaging data from at least one store, via the network and using an imaging extension***, to generate at least one criterion; and
 - recommending at least one hard-copy generation service capable of performing a particular hard-copy generation task matching the at least one criterion***.

(Emphasis Added).

Applicants respectfully assert that *Levine* is legally deficient for the purpose of anticipating claim 1. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that *Levine* does not teach or otherwise disclose at least the features/limitation emphasized above in claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection is improper and requests that the rejection of claim 1 be removed.

With respect to claim 14, Applicants have amended that claim to recite:

14. A method for intelligently routing a task, comprising:
 - accessing imaging data associated with a task using an imaging extension***;
 - acquiring data regarding a plurality of services accessible to a network coupled user computing device;
 - identifying a plurality of parameters that define the task;
 - identifying capabilities of at least one resource associated with each of the plurality of services;

associating at least one decision point with each of the plurality of parameters;
selectively adjusting the at least one decision point to formulate a recommended resource to perform the task; and
recommending the resource capable of performing the task based on use of the at least one decision point.

(Emphasis Added).

Applicants respectfully assert that *Levine* is legally deficient for the purpose of anticipating claim 14. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that *Levine* does not teach or otherwise disclose at least the features/limitation emphasized above in claim 14. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection is improper and requests that the rejection of claim 14 be removed.

Since claim 16 is a dependent claim that incorporates the limitations of claim 14, Applicants respectfully assert that this claim also is in condition for allowance. Additionally, this claim recites other limitations that can serve as an independent basis for patentability.

With respect to claim 17, Applicants have amended that claim to recite:

17. A system for recommending a network coupled resource, comprising:
means for developing a knowledge base concerning the capabilities of available network coupled resources;
means for associating at least one content descriptor with a designated task;
means for developing logic responsive to the knowledge base;
means for communicating the logic and the at least one descriptor to an application;
means for extracting the at least one content descriptor from a document in a data store;
means for identifying a recommended network coupled resource suited to perform a designated data transformation; and
means for recommending the network coupled resource identified.

(Emphasis Added).

Applicants respectfully assert that *Levine* is legally deficient for the purpose of anticipating claim 17. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that *Levine* does not teach or otherwise disclose at least the features/limitation emphasized above in claim 17.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection is improper and requests that the rejection of claim 17 be removed.

Since claims 18 - 20 are dependent claims that incorporate the limitations of claim 17, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims also are in condition for allowance. Additionally, these claims recite other limitations that can serve as an independent basis for patentability.

With respect to claim 24, Applicants have amended that claim to recite:

24. A method for assisting a user in selecting a hardcopy generation service, comprising:
accessing imaging data stored in a personal image repository using an imaging extension;
formulating at least one criterion reflective of the imaging data;
accessing information reflective of a plurality of hardcopy generation services;
using the at least one criterion to identify hardcopy generation services;
and
recommending the identified hardcopy generation services to the user.

(Emphasis Added).

Applicants respectfully assert that *Duke '910* is legally deficient for the purpose of anticipating claim 24. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that *Duke '910* does not teach or otherwise disclose at least the features/limitation emphasized above in claim 24. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection is improper and requests that the rejection of claim 24 be removed.

Since claims 26, 28 – 30, 34 and 35 are dependent claims that incorporate the limitations of claim 24, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims also are in condition for allowance. Additionally, these claims recite other limitations that can serve as an independent basis for patentability.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action indicates that claims 2 and 8 - 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Levine* in view of *Yeung*. The Office Action also indicates that claims 3, 4, 15 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Levine* in view of *Aiello*; that claims 5, 7, 21 and 23 are rejected under as being unpatentable over *Levine* in view of *Duke '910*; that claim 6 is rejected under as being unpatentable over *Levine* in view of *King*; that claims 25 and 27 are rejected under as being unpatentable over *Duke '910* in view of *King*; and that claims 31 - 33 are rejected under as being unpatentable over *Duke '910* in view of *Mastie*. With respect to claims 2, 8, 25 and 27, Applicants have canceled these claims and respectfully assert that the rejections as to these claims have been rendered moot. With respect to the remaining claims, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

With respect to the rejection of claims 9 – 13, Applicants submit herewith a Declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.131 indicating that the invention was conceived prior to the critical date of *Yeung*. In particular, the critical date of *Yeung* is November 10, 2001. The Declaration shows that Applicants exercised diligence through the constructive reduction to practice of the invention. That is, the Applicants exercised diligence through the filing date of the application. Applicants respectfully assert that such showing renders the use of *Yeung* inapplicable for rejecting the pending claims and respectfully request that the rejection be removed. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the claims 9 – 13 be placed in condition for allowance.

With respect to the rejection of claims 3, 4, 15 and 22, Applicants respectfully assert that *Levine* and *Aiello*, either individually or in combination, are legally deficient for the purpose of rendering these claims unpatentable. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that none of the references or combinations thereof teaches or reasonably suggests at least the

features/limitations emphasized above in claims 1, 14 or 17, respectively. That is, *Aiello* does not teach or reasonably suggest the limitations set forth above in these independent claims that are lacking in *Levine*. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 3 and 4 (each of which incorporates the limitations of claim 1), claim 15 (which incorporates the limitations of claim 14), and claim 22 (which incorporates the limitations of claim 17), are in condition for allowance. Additionally, these claims recite other features/limitations that can serve as an independent basis for patentability.

With respect to the rejection of claims 5, 7, 21 and 23, Applicants respectfully assert that *Levine* and *Duke '910*, either individually or in combination, are legally deficient for the purpose of rendering these claims unpatentable. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that none of the references or combinations thereof teaches or reasonably suggests at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claims 1 or 17, respectively. That is, *Duke '910* does not teach or reasonably suggest the limitations set forth above in these independent claims that are lacking in *Levine*. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 5 and 7 (which incorporate the limitations of claim 1), and claims 21 and 23 (each of which incorporates the limitations of claim 17) are in condition for allowance. Additionally, these claims recite other features/limitations that can serve as an independent basis for patentability.

With respect to the rejection of claims 31 - 33, Applicants respectfully assert that *Duke '910* and *Mastie*, either individually or in combination, are legally deficient for the purpose of rendering these claims unpatentable. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that none of the references or combinations thereof teaches or reasonably suggests at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claim 24. That is, *Mastie* does not teach or reasonably suggest the limitations set forth above in independent claim 24 that are lacking in *Duke '910*. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 31 - 33 (each of which

incorporates the limitations of claim 24) are in condition for allowance. Additionally, these claims recite other features/limitations that can serve as an independent basis for patentability.

Cited Art Made of Record

The cited art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.


Respectfully submitted,



M. Paul Qualey, Reg. No. 43,024

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on 6/29/05.



Signature